



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/893,829 06/28/2001 Raja Krishnaswamy MS174293.1 5228 27195 7590 11/15/2004 **EXAMINER** AMIN & TUROCY, LLP EL HADY, NABIL M 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER CLEVELAND, OH 44114 2154

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/893, 829	KRISHNASWAMY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nabil M El-Hady	2154
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 06 October 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	ication. A proper reply to a iich places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acceptable, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 ension and the corresponding amount of the distallary period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee he fee. The appropriate extension fee under high the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C		•
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request to application in condition for allowance because: €		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLEL	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims	• • • —	,
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:	
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to: none.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-27</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ ap	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	- 10011
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		N. SHADT
		Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A. Primary Patent Examiner Art Unit: 2154

Continuation of 10. Other: 23. In the remarks, applicants argued that Cohen does not disclose a method call interceptor rather, he discloses a generated proxy intercepts the call method; Cohen does not teach or suggest the application code generic proxy operable to receive an intercepted method call; Cohen does not teach invoking a method on an object by the application code generic proxy. As Examiner explained in the rejection of the claims, Cohen discloses a method call interceptor (designated as the local generated proxy e.g. B' in col. 3, lines 57-63, proxy B'). Cohen also discloses the application code generic proxy (col. 3, lines 57-63, proxy B'), operable to receive an intercepted method call (col. 3, lines 59-60). Cohen also discloses invoking a method on an object by the application code generic proxy (method foo() of col. 3, lines 34-62, and col. 7, lines 7-9).